



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,929	11/19/2003	Karl Guthrie	P 6040.13006	3155

30615 7590 01/18/2007
BIRDWELL & JANKE, LLP
1100 SW SIXTH AVENUE
SUITE 1400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

LUGO, CARLOS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3676

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,929	GUTHRIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lugo	3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on November 3, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 34-45,58 and 59 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,702,218 to Onofrio in view of US Pat No 3,332,118 to Temple et al (Temple) and further in view of US Pat No 4,615,514 to Hamlin.

Regarding claim 34, Onofrio discloses a toggle bolt comprising a hole plug (16') that has a hole plugging portion (main body) for centering the plug in the hole (22) and a lip portion (where 16' is pointing in Figure 7) for fixing the position of the plug against the object (24).

The bolt further comprises a toggle bar (18) adapted for pivoting between a closed position for insertion through the hole into the opening space and an open position in which the toggle bar cannot be withdrawn from the opening space back through the hole.

Onofrio fails to disclose that a flexible cable having a proximal end having an anchoring attachment and a distal end connected to the toggle bar. At the instant, Onofrio discloses the use of a rod.

Temple teaches that it is well known in the art to have a flexible member that could be a cable (Figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the member described by Onofrio as a flexible cable, as taught by Temple, in order to, first, provide a simple way to operate the toggle bar, and second, in order to provide a mechanism that will be simple in construction and in operation.

Further, Onofrio fails to disclose that an end of the toggle bar is adapted for locking engagement with the hole plug in the closed position. Onofrio illustrates that the ends of the toggle bar are capable to rest against the cone surface of the hole plug (16') in the closed position.

Hamlin teaches that it is well known in the art to provide a plug (36) that includes a recess that is capable of receiving and holding a toggle bar in a closed position.

It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the plug member described by Onofrio with a recess that can be adapted to receive the toggle bar, as taught by Hamlin, in order to hold the toggle bar in the closed position so as to introduce the bar through the opening of the member.

As to claim 35, Onofrio, as modified by Hamlin, teaches that the end of the toggle bar is adapted for releasable retention in a recess of the hole plug to provide the locking engagement.

Art Unit: 3676

As to claim 36, Onofrio, as modified by Temple and Hamlin, teaches that the cable extends through a substantially centrally disposed aperture through the hole plug, and wherein the end of the toggle bar is tapered to provide for the retention.

As to claims 37-39, Onofrio discloses that the toggle bolt further comprises a plug biasing compression spring (26) for biasing the hole plug toward the toggle bar.

As to claims 40-45, Onofrio fails to disclose that the toggle bolt further comprises a toggle bar pivot control member for manipulation of the toggle bar.

Hamlin teaches that it is well known in the art to provide a toggle pivot control member (25 or 27) for manipulation of a toggle bar (20 or 22).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the toggle bolt described by Onofrio with a control member, as taught by Hamlin, in order to be able to move the toggle bar.

As to claims 58 and 59, Onofrio, as modified by Temple and Hamlin, teaches a method for anchoring to an object having a hole therethrough leading to an opening space comprising the steps of providing a safety toggle bolt having a handle member and a toggle bar pivotally connected to the handle member; locking the toggle bar in a closed position; inserting the safety toggle bolt through the hole; and pushing on the handle member so as to unlock the toggle bar from the closed position and releasing the handle member after pushing the handle member so that the toggle bar is automatically pulled toward the hole plug to adjust the bolt.

4. **Claims 46-57 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,702,218 to Onofrio in view of US Pat No 3,332,118 to Temple et al (Temple)

and further in view of US Pat No 4,615,514 to Hamlin as applied to claims 34-45, and further in view of US Pat No 5,209,621 to Burbidge.

Onofrio, as modified by Temple and Hamlin, fails to disclose that the toggle bar further comprises a toggle bar return spring attached to the toggle bar.

Burbidge teaches that it is well known in the art to have a toggle bolt assembly comprising a toggle bar (18) that has a toggle bar returns spring (40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate into Onofrio's device a toggle return spring, as taught by Burbidge, in order to bias the toggle bar to the open position after been inserted through the opening.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on November 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to the applicant's arguments with respect to a conclusion of obviousness (Page 2 Line 1), the argument is not persuasive. A conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.

As to the applicant's arguments that by providing the flexible cable that Temple teach into the device described by Onofrio, the mechanism would be capable of perform (Page 2 Line 15), the argument is not persuasive.

Onofrio, when operated, move the bar 18 from a retracted to an open position. Temple, when operated, move the cable so as to move the bar from a retracted

(Figure 1) to an extended position (Figure 2). At the instant, is clearly shown that both devices moves the bar in the same way. Therefore, providing the teachings of Temple into the device described by Onofrio would not affect the mechanism or the operation of the bolt assembly.

As to the arguments with respect to provide the teachings of Hamlin into the device described by Onofrio (Page 3 Line 16), specially, that Hamlin does not teach the closed position described in the claims. The arguments are not persuasive.

As seen in Figure 2a and in page 6 line 15, in the closed position, the arms are held in the plug 22a. Therefore, as demonstrated before in attachment #1 attached to the last Office Action mailed on August 4, 2006, Hamlin clearly teach this limitation.

Finally, as to the applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 58 and 59 (Page 4 Line 4), Onofrio, as modified by Temple and Hamlin, discloses the invention as claimed.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

Art Unit: 3676

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 571-272-7058. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-7pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Carlos Lugo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3676

January 8, 2007.